

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

This is in response to the Office Action dated March 14, 2005 rejecting all pending claims 1-8. Dependent claim 2 is canceled herein, claims 1 and 3-8 are currently pending. Reconsideration of all pending claims as amended herein is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103

The Examiner rejects claims 1-4 and 6-8 under 35 USC 103 based on US Patent 5,576,981 Parker et al (Parker) in view of US Patent 5,865,546 Ganthier et al (Ganthier).

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 USC 103 based on Parker in view of Ganthier as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US Patent 5,150,118 Finkle (Finkle).

The invention as described in each of the independent claims 1, 6 and 8 herein includes a personal computer keyboard comprising a foundation into which various removable inserts can be placed and connected to provide for different functionalities such as computer games. More specifically, the keyboard can be used as an input device for a host computer that can execute one or more specific gaming application software programs. The keyboard can further include a removable part as claimed with a set of specific keys each of which interacts with corresponding contact. [See Application, pp.12-13; Fig. 5.] Each key can also interact with a corresponding contact on the fixed part in a one-to-one correspondence. [See Fig. 5.] The removable part can be associated with a specific gaming application software program to be executed on the host computer. Other distinguishable features of the invention are further recited in the pending claims.

Meanwhile, Parker provides a "portable bar code reader including a keyboard and a bar code system computer." [Abstract.] There are several reasons as to why Parker fails to disclose or suggest incorporating or integrating its portable bar code reader with relatively standard types of personal computer keyboards (see Ganthier).

First, Parker clearly differentiates “portable bar code readers” from “stationery bar code readers.” “Portable bar code readers are used by store clerks to record the number of items on the shelves by reading the bar codes” and are used by “department and grocery stores to inventory products on the shelf.” [col. 1, lns. 24-26 and 32-34.] Contrastly, Parker explains that “stationery bar code readers have been located at the checkout stand for reading the bar codes of products as they are purchased. The stationery bar code readers are permanently coupled to a bar code computer system that maintains the inventory information.” Id. at lns. 27-32.] The size or type of keypad disclosed in Parker (see 101, 200 and 202 in Figs. 1 and 2, respectively) are different from larger sized keyboards that are not readily “portable” and more likely used instead with “stationery” types of bar code readers. It would therefore not be obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify the portable bar code reader described in Parker with a relatively standard type personal computer keyboard which typically has a large footprint and does not lend itself for use with portable or mobile applications.

Second, Parker discloses a standard keyboard port that is coupled to a data bus for receiving the desired string data from the string data memory. [col. 8, lns. 12-24.] This description appears to suggest that a separate port is provided for the Parker bar code reader to communicate with a separate standard type of personal computer keyboard device. If indeed this is the case, then it would not be obvious to modify the keypads in Parker with Ganthier which “teaches a personal computer keyboard of the more conventional type...” [Office Action, pp. 9-10.] Such a type of relatively larger personal computer keyboard mentioned in Ganthier would be connected to the portable bar code reader in addition to – not in lieu of – the relatively smaller keypads in Parker.

At the same time, Ganthier provides a modular keyboard assembly that allows input devices to be inserted into the keyboard assembly. “Each input device module can be replaced by the user with a different input device module providing flexibility to the user as well as minimizing the amount of cabling that typically confronts the user.” [Abstract.] Moreover, the Examiner contends that Ganthier discloses “a specific software application to be executed on said host computer (column 6, lines 17-21)”, but upon closer examination of the cited

specification, “appropriate software drivers for controlling the operation of each input device module” is described – not applications software programs.

Accordingly, there is no suggestion or description in the Parker and Ganthier or other references of record when considered individually or together which describe the invention as claimed herein.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of independent claims 1, 6 and 8 be withdrawn. Because the dependent claims related thereto include further limitations in addition to those recited in their corresponding independent claim, all depending claims are also allowable over the cited references of record.

The cited references of record neither disclose nor suggest the invention as presently claimed when considered individually or in combination with one another. Allowance of all pending claims 1 and 3-8 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is in form for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned attorney.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required, including petition fees and extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 23-2415 (Docket No. 27986-713).

Respectfully submitted,

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI



U.P. Peter Eng, Reg. No. 39,666

Date: September 14, 2005

650 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304
(650) 320-4847
Customer No. 021971